

Transcript

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group 5 March 2015 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group teleconference on 5 March 2015 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-transliteration-contact-05mar15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Jim Galvin - RySG
Amr Elsadr – NCUC
Ubolthip Sethakaset – Individual
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Roger Carney – RrSG
Pitinan Kooarmornpatana – GAC
Wanawit Ahkuputra - GAC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Justine Chew - Individual

Apologies:

Jennifer Chung
Emily Taylor – RrSG
Peter Dernbach- IPC
ICANN staff:
Howard Li
Julie Hedlund – Staff
Lars Hoffmann
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This conference call is now being recorded.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you (Tim). Would you like me to do a roll call for you Chris?

Chris Dillon: Yes please.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Translation and Transliteration Contact Information PDP Working Group on Thursday the 5th of March, 2015.

And on the call we have Amr Elsadr, Jim Galvin, Chris Dillon, Petter Rindforth, Pitinan Kooarmornpatan, Roger Carney, Rudi Vansnick, Ubolthip Sethakaset, and Wanawit Ahkuputra.

Excuse my pronunciation of some of the names. I think we have all the participants on. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Glen DeSaintgery. Have I left off anyone?

If not, may I just remind you to state your name before speaking for the transcription? And thank you. It's over to you Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed and let's just go into Number 3 on the agenda, which is statements of interest. So this is just in case somebody has a change in statement of interest since we last met. Seeing nothing and hearing nothing I think that means it's all right to continue into the main part of today's work which is looking at the review tool.

Now last week we finished actually at Number 56. And so most of today's meeting will be dealing with points from Number 56 onwards, but if anybody would like to go back and readdress anything that we've dealt with either in Singapore or last week, they are more than welcome to do so.

All right, in that case I'll just scroll down carefully to Number 57, and I'm intending to pick up comments that are from that point on. Amr, would you like to raise something?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. Again the point I raised last week is that it's very difficult to track back and review any of the comments that have previously been addressed and that's the column with the working group responses filled out. And that has not been done on the - not for the version on the Adobe Connect Room (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: No, unfortunately that hasn't been done this week. So if we want to go back and look at things I've got my own handwritten notes which we can consult. But that's more or less all we have this week. Is there actually one that you'd like to pick up?

Amr Elsadr: Oh no there isn't - not that I'm aware of. I would like to get a look at the whole document with the responses. If I'm not mistaken, someone had mentioned that there is one actually available on the working group wiki, if someone could (unintelligible).

Chris Dillon: No the version in the wiki is the same as the version we're looking at. So it's one week out of date. But if there is something specific I've got fairly good notes about what we said last week, so I can go back. But for this week it needs to be like that. Ah yes (unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr again. Yes it would actually be helpful if there is a version with the working group response column filled out that is circulated sooner hopefully rather than later. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Now Lars is saying in the chat room that we will have an up-to-date version tomorrow. It's even possible that we might get to the end of the document, that it would be complete. But let's see how things go. Ah yes, okay, and this is just being picked up by Amr and Rudi in the chat room.

All right, so let us come to comment Number 57. And I think this is an example of something which I think is actually not particularly new but got the benefits of the doubt. So if we weren't sure whether it was new or not, we tended to put it in.

So this one is where does the requirement to data transformation end? Could Chinese law enforcement agents require a contracted party to translate, transliterate existing English contact details into Mandarin? Or what if the original registration was in a third language or script - for example Russian

Cyrillic? Would that translation skip English and go into Chinese? What if the service provider supported neither of these languages?

So here as I was saying, I think this is really not particularly new. This - and right from the beginning we have only looked at whether we should be transforming into ASCII or into English. We've never dealt with anything else. And it doesn't mean that people couldn't - actors couldn't do things - outside the system. But the scope of this group is definitely only that. I guess our response to that one will be a long (day's time).

Jim Galvin: I don't know if you're caught up in your e-mail, and I know that the office is closed today. But just wanted to alert you to the fact that we need to send out (Rahm)'s disk for, you know, forensic recovery. And...

Man: Jim? We can hear you on the call, so you might want to mute your mic.

Jim Galvin: Yes, sorry about that guys. I'm off now.

Chris Dillon: No problem. Okay so any comments about Number 57 before we move on?

All right so that means we got to go as far as the next one, which is about compliance. Compliance should consider budgetary impact of the human resources needed to review translated WHOIS data.

And yes I mean certainly resource necessary for reviewing data could be really quite substantial. And the thing I thought of here is -- this is something I brought up briefly last week - if you are reviewing really the every single thing in the database that is being transformed, this is an absolutely huge job.

On the other hand if you've got a system which is ad hoc, so things are only transformed if they need to be transformed, then obviously that's a much, much smaller job. So it is just that distinction between transforming absolutely everything that isn't Latin script or just doing something ad hoc.

And that is - you know, the amount of effort in those two activities is hugely different. Thought that might be a good time to raise that.

All right, again I think this may be something that's not particularly new but it's been given the benefit of the doubt. Amr, would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. Actually I wanted to go back to 57. I apologize. I think I missed the opportunity to comment on that. But I would be happy to wait for you to finish your point now before I do that.

Chris Dillon: Actually I had finished that moment. So you're very welcome to pick up something from 57.

Amr Elsadr: Okay thanks. Well I can't claim to be an expert on answering this question - Number 57 - but I would imagine that the only requirements that contracted parties are required to fulfill are those in their contracts with ICANN as well as whatever their local laws say they have to do.

But I would differentiate between them and staying within the boundaries of their local laws and what law enforcement agencies tell them to do. So I think this is a distinction that should probably be made in response to this question.

I can imagine situations where a law enforcement agency might go to a registrar and instruct it to - or a registry - and instruct it to perform a certain action that it might not necessarily be required to perform under law.

And the registrar/registry would - I would assume - would be within its right to tell the law enforcement agency to obtain a court order to that effect. So those are just my thoughts on the response to Question 57. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. Yes I mean I think all I can do is agree. So there could be a difference between the contractual obligations and what law enforcement asks, yes. (Order) okay thank you very much for that.

Now moving up, and Jim is just saying that we need to be careful about references to law enforcement. Okay. Also just waiting for the chat room to update. Would anybody like to say anything about Number 58? Jim would you like to pick up something?

Jim Galvin: Yes. This is Jim Galvin for the transcript. Sorry I was typing just in response to Amr going back to 57. Again I just wanted to finish the thought that I started to type in the chat room there. There is a difference between, you know, law enforcement versus a court of competent jurisdiction that tells you to do things.

Now this'll vary a little bit, you know, in some regions of the world. But, you know, in most Western cultures you don't just do because law enforcement says. You know, you push back on them to provide you with a court directed order.

And that's my only comment about we need to be careful about how we respond to this law enforcement issue and draw that distinction which itself can vary around the world between law enforcement and court of competent jurisdiction. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. And Amr is just - looks like Amr and (Justine) are agreeing with these points.

All right so if we perhaps edge downwards, and I think our next stop is 62. Okay and then we've got the flight of bad actors which is - oh yes, okay. So we're fairly aware of this idea that bad actors could intentionally move their operations into smaller languages. So that's something that we've spoken about before.

Number 62 is saying flight of bad actors is a weak argument as there are very few bad actors but many domain names as people tend to host locally. And this transformation will be a very limited use since least translatable would assume that the searcher and the registrant speak different languages, use different scripts.

I mentioned this briefly last week. I mean it actually almost touches on something larger because certainly statistically speaking I think it might have been Emily Taylor who provided some statistics on this. This sort of abuse is certainly quite rare at the moment.

And the question really comes up, you know, to what extent are we protecting against things which are currently happening? And to what extent are we protecting about things which theoretically could happen but haven't really happened very much yet? So it touches on that.

All right now would anybody like to raise something about that? Jim is that an old hand up there or would you like to say something?

Jim Galvin: Sorry, old hand.

Chris Dillon: No problem. All right. Now I reckon that Number 63 has been covered earlier on. And I wouldn't like to say where we dealt with this but this is basically the issue about what to call the database. And so certainly it won't be domain name relay - DNR - because that acronym is used for other things. But we have already addressed that. Petter, would you like to bring something?

Petter Rindforth: Yes hi, Petter here. Sorry, I missed last time. So were you discussing it there or - just so that I know what your conclusion was.

Chris Dillon: Yes I think the conclusion is DNRD-DS seems to be the most - that seems to be the recommended term at the moment.

Petter Rindforth: Okay and then that's convenient with FSAC's terms.

Chris Dillon: Yes it's basically the term brought up in a recent FSAC document. I've actually forgotten the number. It might be 60 or 61, somewhere around there.

Petter Rindforth: Okay thanks, excellent.

Chris Dillon: All right Petter that is something that came up in one of the other ones. I think it might have been last week or if not that - if not then in Singapore. And that - oh yes and Amr is saying he's not in favor of using the term. Amr then I'm quite curious. What would you like to suggest?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr. I think within the GNSO and any PDP associated with domain name registration data, the common term has always been WHOIS. And this term will probably officially change at some point after the post-EWG PDP takes place, which will probably last for quite a long time.

But I would stick to WHOIS. That would be my recommendation. And when we address it in the future tense we can point out you know we're talking about the WHOIS database now and also regarding whatever form or name it carries in the future. But WHOIS is what we've always used in the GNSO and on the PDP Working Group so I really see no reason to change that now. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay thank you for that. Now Rudi is sympathizing with Amr on that one in the chat room. Jim would you like to bring something up about that?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you. Jim Galvin for the transcript. I understand, you know, completely the idea that, you know, we're sort of in this transition state and we started out using WHOIS and we have this new terminology that we're sort of evolving to. And most of the community really has been very good about transitioning to this terminology when that's possible.

I would suggest that we think about and seriously consider being explicitly part of the transition. So if it's possible to do something like if we use WHOIS, you know, always in parentheses indicate what the future terminology term would be alongside of it. I mean this could be a copy edit thing.

We could also do the reverse, you know, which is here's the real term and then in parentheses say WHOIS and maybe an extra adjective to describe what part of who it is that we want. That would just be my request and suggestion for the group to consider.

I won't fall on my sword over this, but as someone who really was a strong advocate for the new terminology even in FSAC just doing my part here to try and promote that new terminology and anything that we can do to help the community and all of us kind of move towards it. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much Jim. Goodness this is a surprisingly difficult one and really hard to please all parties. I have sympathy on both sides here. So there is something wonderful about using the word "WHOIS" because everybody understands it.

The term "DNRD-DS" is really horrendous. I mean it just - it really doesn't flow. It's very difficult to remember what it stands for. However, I don't really want to go against FSAC because in their report they are very, very keen that the word "WHOIS" is not used, that what they're doing -- what will happen now - if it is a new system.

So it's - this is - I think it's an area where we probably can't - we can't please everybody and not - this is not an easy thing. Amr would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Chris. This is Amr again. I know I made the suggestion for WHOIS, but on the other hand I do very much sympathize with the points that Jim has made, and I find them perfectly understandable and plausible.

My concern with using RDS - or registration directory services - is its very close association within the GNSO community to what the EWG is doing because EWG - the Expert Working Group - is the expert working group on the new model of the registration directory services.

And what is problematic with that in my perspective - and this has also been expressed by some of my NCSG colleagues when we were discussing this on one of our calls and also on this - is that it sort of - it may associated the outcome of this PDP with the Expert Working Group recommendations which are still not policy.

And that is very important at this point to acknowledge - well, maybe less so now than it was over the past year when the process of integrating the EWG work into the regular GNSO process, how that was going to happen.

But there is a bit of sensitivity on sort of using that terminology because of that reason. WHOIS is the traditional term used within the GNSO at least. And since this is a GNSO policy and it's a GNSO PP working group then that's really why I thought it would be favorable to (use).

But like Jim I will not die in a ditch over this or fall over on my sword or insist in any way. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. I think that adds some interesting perspective to this that by using DNRD-DS we could in fact be causing a further amount of confusion. And, you know, that point about policy is taken as well.

This makes me really feel like using the plain English of WHOIS replacement which is really understandable by everybody. It may be DNRD-DS or

conceivably it may be something else. And it doesn't have the disadvantages of the sort of policy disadvantages that Amr was just talking about.

So thinking it through, that's the way I am tending just at the moment but it's, you know - as I was saying earlier, it's an area where it's very difficult to please everybody.

All right so that perhaps means that we can just come a little bit further down in the spreadsheet to Number 64. Okay and this is - if we thought that last one was difficult, this one really makes you think as well.

Okay so the IPC finds it counterproductive to evaluate the feasibility of data translation and transliteration together in part because this combination gives rise to the argument that automated systems would not be able to know when to translate and when to transliterate.

In the vast majority of cases, transliteration is most important to fulfill its function of enhancing transparency and accountability in the DNS. Bangkok is noted as an exception. Right. So I think - I think counterproductive is actually far too heavy a word here.

So I mean I agree with - to the extent that it's rather difficult to imagine a system that was doing very much translation. I think overwhelmingly this is going to - it is likely that this would be transliteration rather than translation. So we're the same on that one.

And, you know, the only problem is that you're going to end up if you use nothing but transliteration, you will end up with Zhōng Guó for China and things like that. And you know you also get these situations over Krung Thep and Bangkok which are not ideal.

As I mentioned I think last week thinking about it, almost more problematic are situations where, you know, ideally you might have words like road and

street, but what you're going to end up with is the sort of local language equivalent.

So again, to use Chinese examples, you'll end up with jiē rather than road or street. Just not - I think those cases are actually more problematic than just isolated cases where you've got a major difference between the form that's used internationally -- Bangkok - and the one that's used if you used transliteration -- Krung Thep.

But yes I think - I think actually I disagree with the point. I think we can legitimately bring them together. I think not doing so causes more problems than doing so solves.

All right so - oh yes, okay. Now Rudi's typing something in here. Oh yes so before that Amr was saying that (Farmart) was involved in the - yes there was a study done on available systems.

And I'm glad Amr has brought that up because one feeling I have had is that I have possibly been too optimistic about the available systems. I think we're much better to stick with the study which serves really at the moment - there is a huge problem in this area of automated systems.

They don't work very well and I think in the past I have said things where I've said well some of them worked better than others. But for this sort of use where, you know, there are lots of proper names and consistency and accuracy are really important, if you bear that in mind, the only thing you can do is go back to those studies and say that these automated tools are generally speaking not very helpful yet.

Conceivably in the future that may change. But thinking about it possibly I haven't been as clear as possibly I should have been about the bad situation we are in with automated systems.

And I also suspect that it could take a lot of time before that situation changes.

All right so yes I think we certainly do need to pay more attention to things like that. And so (Rudy) is then saying it seems there will be a need to identify if the data or transliterated or translated.

Yes I mean certainly that's I think in - I think overwhelming they're going to be fundamentally transliterated. The other question is whether there will be any translation at all.

But then as we said before there may be a case where translation in the case of country names. And yes we are only just repeating what was in the study.

And (Rudy) is mentioning that that could necessitate another - an additional tag. Yes well we spoke about tags last week.

And the problem with tags is that it's not the simple situation which we originally thought where you might have been doing something like tagging this addresses Japanese one tag and perhaps saying this address has been transliterated from Japanese, another tag.

Unfortunately there may be parts of the contact information which are behaving differently so you might have Japanese in one bit and you might have German in another.

And you might also have a situation where you're translating the country. So that means we're ending it with a lot of tags and this system is starting to become rather complicated. So I think we have to be quite aware of those as possibilities.

In some ways yes, tagging it's almost on the way. If tagging is necessary it's almost an argument for not transforming because one suspects that those tags are actually more difficult than we have thought in the past.

Making note of that argument because I'm not sure we've had much of it before. Anything else about tagging or shall we continue?

I think this time we've got to go as far as 67. That - and 67 is saying a global Whois search providing access to data in as uniform a fashion as possible is necessary for the data registration service to achieve its goal of providing transparency and accountability for the DNS.

I again, I think this is not a very new argument but let us pick it up even so. And this is also something which I feel requires some amount of thought to address.

So one of the things I wanted to bring up is that and something that this argument misses is that for me the, you know, the data are fundamentally not uniform.

So if we are talking about the original data and the original languages, you know, these - well they're not uniform in the sense that they exist in several languages.

But, you know, they're quite consistent because those are the forms of the contact data which are usually used locally.

So moving on from that if you transform them you're actually losing accuracy in that transformation process. That's really the thing which I would like to flag up here.

So superficially it may look as if you're making them more uniform but actually in that process you're losing quite a lot of accuracy. And this is perhaps not very obvious when you first read this point.

Amr would you like to pick up something on that?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Chris. Yes I have at least two issues with this statement. The first one being that in principle transformation of contact data makes the DNS more transparent or accountable in any way. I don't see how that is the case.

It may make it easier to use by some actors. And that is also questionable or debatable depending on how accurate this transformation can be done.

But I certainly don't see it enhancing transparency or accountability. It just helps certain people who have knowledge of a certain language or script to use it effectively transferring transaction costs from one actor to another. So that's one thing.

The second issue is singling out transliteration in this comment and stating that it's more important to achieve this accountability or transparency or enhancing those.

I can see how that could be the perception when it comes to a registrant's name. I think this becomes very problematic when you want to transform other data like physical addresses for example. I think would be extremely useless to in many cases to transliterated physical addresses.

Because for example if I list my address in Arabic and say that I live in a certain (shada) which is street, transliterating (shada) is really - won't really be helpful anyway at all. And I would think translation would be more helpful this context so I just wanted to point that out. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. That's fairly close to a point I was making earlier in fact. Jim would you like to add something to that?

Jim Galvin: Yes thank you Jim Galvin. I think what concerns me is I'm not convinced this is the new argument which is the way that you have this flagged.

You know, I agree with everything that Amr said and I'll add to that. I question what is meant by uniform, you know, in the statement.

I mean I think an argument can be made that says that the data is uniform if it is in an original form that is accurate and validated.

You know, from my point of view that's certainly accounts for accountability. And the fact that it's available to you certainly makes it transparent.

You know, I mean it's accountable because if it's accurate and it's validated then, you know, you have a higher probability of being able to do something useful to it.

You know, and I think that particular point gets lost in these discussions about transformation.

It's interesting to talk about transforming the data for whatever reason and to whatever someone might think is an interesting destination.

But I really think that it loses the fact that having data in its original form, you know, from just a purely technical point of view is, you know, generally the best.

You know, I mean that gives you the most opportunity to do whatever you need to do with it so that it's useful to you in your context.

If you transform it you are forcing people to a singular context and that might be useful in many cases but it also loses something.

So, you know, I am not convinced this is a new argument and, you know, I really question what their bias is in terms of what is uniform fashion. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. I yes I find the word uniform rather odd. (Effer) would you like to add something?

(Effer): But just quick reply to what Amr said that would be more usable for some actors.

I would say that rather for all actors and but we come to point 70 later on where that we see with just point out some of the examples of where let's say the normal Google user wants to have a usable, readable Whois contact information.

There are a number of cases where you need to get into it and with a quick search. And as I said before then once you get into more pure tech or legal aspects yes of course you need to reach out to the local contact and have the local address. But I would say that for the initial global use it's necessary.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. All right I think we can probably go further down to in fact because only just the next one which is Number 68 unless there's anything else about that.

So the more global the impact the more important it is for data be accessible in globally searchable languages. Example EU trademarks registered in 12 languages, international trademark registrations covering 92 territories use three languages -- English French and Spanish.

Let's - I think this is new because what it's doing is it's comparing the situation to things going on in other areas where there are attempts to supply

transformations in, you know, even not in just one language in several. So from that point of view it's interesting.

It's also incredibly alarming because, you know, the cost of particularly transforming the whole database into several languages I mean trying to get it into one common language would be I mean I'm - I should be more careful.

Transforming it once and we'd probably be transliterating rather than translating in fact is going to be very, very expensive. Doing it several times you just - one can't really imagine that that could happen. The resources necessary are just huge.

Now a couple of things going on I'll just come to Jim in a moment but I think Amr has typed something.

Okay so he is asking Petter whether he - suggesting that all present and future users are proficient in English or another Latin based script?

Okay so yes I mean both in China and in India. I think that's probably quite I mean those are huge cases where that may not be the case especially going back more to the last point. But Amr isn't saying out of the Arabic world as well the Arab world. Jim would you like to raise something here?

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Jim Galvin for the transcript. So I guess I just want to throw out there I have trouble -- you know, and maybe it's just me so I guess this is why I put it out here -- when we compare trademarks to registration data.

I mean I appreciate the trademarks, you know, are registered in 12 languages, you know, translated all over the place and in different languages.

But the thing that concerns me is, you know, with trademarks it's about that object. It's about that data and what it looks like. You know, I mean if it's registered in 12 languages isn't that 12 different marks?

I mean I appreciate in a legal context that those are all the same thing. But I'm either going to use my English mark all over the world or I'm going to create a different mark to use elsewhere.

And, you know, whenever you're doing comparisons to trademarks you're looking for - you can't look up in the database for what's the word I want here, not for inexact matches right?

I mean they're always looking for exact matches to see that you're using it or, you know, searching and looking for inexact matches is not a trivial thing to do. I mean we have that problem in our registration data. We're going to have that problem in trademarks.

So anyway I guess I'm trying to make two points here. I have trouble comparing registration data to trademarks because they're just not the same object. And the rules that apply to them are not the same in my view.

So when they try to say that because it's the right thing to do in trademarks it must be the right thing to do in registration data I don't make that leap. I don't see how that leap applies. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. So fundamentally, you know, it effectively you may be ending up with a different mark each language that is used whereas with an address fundamentally you've got an address in a particular local language.

And then if that's going to be transformed it has to be done in a consistent way. But it's not that you're producing something new. You're just trying to mirror that original as closely as possible.

So if I think that's true. I think it is a different situation but just interesting one anyway. Petter would you like to pick up something?

Petter Rindforth: Yes just a clarification. We're not talking about translation on the trademarks. We're talking about specifically the list of goods and services put on some of the contact information.

So and then of course when you file an international trademark through the WIPO system (unintelligible) system you have to state if the trademark is - means something in any language.

But actually what we - where we noted this in the reply it was comparing to the contact information and the lists of goods and services.

And I mean when you file a community trademark you show your own or at least you start with one language and then you also have to choose one of the official languages.

And then you can either provide your own translation and the listing goods and services or otherwise it's done by the OMB community itself.

So they have more or less automatic translation service. And as it's translated the same way for each trademark it's accepted as such. Because you can read it in all the other European languages as well as in your own and understand what it is.

Chris Dillon: Thank you for that. So in many ways if some actor in the future does go for transformation it's, you know, it's an interesting model to be aware of. I think that's really what is coming out of that.

And just having a bit of a look at what's going on in the chat room and I slightly lost the track. As Peter is saying what when it comes to pure business and legal aspects and then Amr is coming back saying there are local services in Egypt that are not provided online in Arabic.

Okay no reason to assume that the consumers of these service speak English or other languages okay.

I wouldn't be surprised if that is the case in other countries using other languages scripts. I'm sure that's right.

And then lastly Amr is missing the association between issues pertaining to trademark list of goods and services and contact data.

Yes. So I think, you know, for me they are rather different things. But what is interesting about this is that they've got a sort of a mechanism for doing transformations. That is worth being aware of.

Right, I think whilst we are waiting for things - oh yes there are a couple of things happening in the chat room. But as we wait for that I'll just see if we can - okay.

I'll just remark now that 69 is also flagged as being a new argument but I think that we can legitimately deal with it with 68 because it's saying given the global nature and use of the Whois it is important to have Whois data transferred into the most common language and script.

This is very close to - it's actually not just 68. We have dealt with this before now so I think we don't really need to revisit that one.

Then okay then there has been a few changes in the chat room. Why are we discussing mechanisms? We're supposed to be discussing desirability?

It's a good point. However I think there is a link between desirability we have to be very, very careful that anything we say is desirable or not can actually be done.

So to some extent we have to be aware of what was likely to be possible before we can actually decide that. That would really be my coming back to that, you know, why are we discussing mechanisms.

I think we have to be quite careful that there is a likelihood of something working because we wouldn't want to say that something impossible was desirable.

Then Petter is saying it's an example of automatic translation that works and is accepted. Gracious me that is - that's - that really, I would really like to pick that up. That's a major point.

And then Amr is saying thanks missed the point again. Then (Rudy) is saying we still have to cover 14 points and we're close to the hour. So yes I'm afraid we will need another session. I was hoping we might get through today but it wasn't to be.

Okay yes the ability to actually do something will impact his desirability yes. Yes that's really the conclusion I come to you because if you stick just to the desirability there is a really - there is a - there really is a possibility that you might declare something is desirable and actually is not possible to do it. So I'm much happier to recommend things which are possible.

Okay and we have a few minutes left to ask and thank you Amr is agreeing with that. So we might be able to make just a little bit more - well I should ask you know whether there's any other business?

I don't think there - if there isn't then that means we might be able to get a little bit more done. And specifically that means I think going into number 70.

No, Number 70 unfortunately is a very long so I think we would actually do better to stop now and then start with that rather complicated thing at the

beginning of next call unless the - somebody - I'd rather do that than to just a mess of it now in the few minutes we have left.

So I going to update. Okay so in that case unless somebody would like to develop some of the arguments we've already had or bring something else up I would suggest that we adjourn until next week.

Click the chat room. Okay Petter would you like to raise something?

Petter Rindforth: Yes Petter. I had just quick from legacy point of view. I will prepare to keep the time limit that we start with actually Point 73 and discuss the specific possibilities that we are written because otherwise are more examples.

Chris Dillon: Do you mean the point about the GAC?

Petter Rindforth: Yes the Point 73, 74, 75...

Chris Dillon: Oh yes okay.

Petter Rindforth: ...where we would like to have your point...

Chris Dillon: Yes. That's, yes that we can certainly do. They are quite short. As long as we're just aware that we...

Petter Rindforth: Yes or to - I mean to start with it with the next time...

Chris Dillon: Oh.

Petter Rindforth: ...so we don't take so much time on...

Chris Dillon: Right.

Petter Rindforth: ...on 70 because that's more of examples.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Yes all - yes all right, yes that's all right by me. And yes to answer (Rudy)'s point we will be working on an updated document next week.

Yes okay. Well in that case basically let us meet again at the same time next week. Oh, just a moment before we stop. Yes, okay so let's just meet again next week. Thank you very much for today.

I think it's not a complete surprise that this is taking longer than we expected. It is, you know, it really is quite complicated at this stage.

Yes. I think we are hoping to get an updated version as far as 69 tomorrow. Okay in that case thank you very much indeed and we can always pick up things on the list as well. See you next week. Goodbye.

Man: Thanks Chris.

Man: Bye-bye.

Chris Dillon: Thank you. Goodbye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you very much.

END